

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-31 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, various claims have been amended and claims 3-7, 11-15 and 18-31 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 8-10, 16-17 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

The Prior Office Action and Response

Referring, for example, to claim 1, in the prior Amendment, applicants urged that the prior art did not teach or suggest extracting keywords from a body of an e-mail message and further urged that "keywords" which are extracted from the body of an e-mail message are distinct from information pieces such as the subject and the author's name. Applicants pointed out that Figure 5 of the subject application illustrates a separate column for entering key words.

The Current Rejection

In item 7 on page 10 of the current Office Action the Examiner has directed applicants to the newly formatted portion of the rejection set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. In this portion of the Office Action the Examiner has acknowledged that U.S. Patent 5,933,599 to Noland fails to disclose extracting keywords contained in the body of the document and displaying keywords extracted from the document. However, the Examiner takes the position that U.S. Patent 5,835,084 to Bailey teaches a preview pane for displaying extracted key words from a message along with the title of the message.

The Present Claimed Invention Patentably Distinguishes Over the Prior Art

Applicants have reviewed the Bailey reference, and particularly column 2, lines 44-67 and Figure 3 of Bailey which were relied upon by the Examiner. Bailey appears to teach a standard highlight bar/ preview pane combination in which a highlighted message from a list is displayed in a preview pane. The preview pane discloses the entirety of the message; however, depending on the length of the message, the user may not see the entire message on the screen of the preview pane. Bailey does not have any discussion regarding extracting keywords from the body of the message.

Claim 1 and the other remaining independent claims have been amended to clarify the proper meaning of the term "keyword". For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"a document group keyword extraction device to extract keywords contained in the body of a document forming part of each group of documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information."

Referring to the Examiner's reliance upon the Bailey patent, applicants submit that the preview pane disclosed in Bailey does not extract selected words by referring to document group information, but instead displays the entire message. While only a portion of the message may be displayed (depending on the length of the message, the size of the monitor, etc.), the entire message can be scrolled through in the preview pane. Therefore, all words in the message are displayed in Bailey and there is no extraction of keywords.

It is submitted that Bailey clearly does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 1, which include:

"a document group keyword extraction device to extract key words contained in a body of a document forming part of each group of documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information."

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 8 is directed to a display apparatus which includes:

"a topic keyword extraction device to extract keywords contained in a body of each document relevant to each topic obtained by the further classification of each of the groups of documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information and the topic classification information;"

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 8 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 9, is directed to a display method which includes:

"extracting keywords contained in a body of a document forming

part of each group of documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information;"

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 16 is directed to a display method which includes:

"extracting keywords contained in a body of each document relevant to each topic obtained by the further classification of each group of cross-referenced documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information and the topic classification information;"

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 17 is directed to a computer readable storage medium which includes the features of:

"extracting keywords contained in a body of a document forming part of each group of documents based on a statistical analysis by referring to the document group information;"

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 17 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Summary

It is submitted that none of the references, either taken alone or in combination, teach the present claimed invention. Thus, claims 1, 2, 8-10, 16 and 17 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Reconsideration of the claims and an early notice of allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-25-03

By: John C. Garvey
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on July 25, 2003
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Roger Knight
Date: 7/25/03